

### REMARKS

In response to the Office Action mailed March 23, 2006, Applicants amended claims 1, 3, 4, 8 and 18, and cancelled claims 7 and 8. Claims 1-6 and 9-20 are pending.

The Examiner rejected claims 1-5, 7, 8, 12 and 17-19 as being unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) Hochman in view of Utterberg. Claims 7 and 8 were cancelled, so the rejection of this claim should be withdrawn.

As amended, claims 1-5, 12 and 17-19 require a delivery tube having a perforated longitudinal partition with a hub opening.

Hochman does not disclose such a delivery tube. Nor is there any suggestion to modify Hochman to provide such a tube. It appears that the Examiner likens the perforated longitudinal opening required by claims 1-5, 12 and 17-19 to the Hochman's slot 24. Applicants do not concede that this is appropriate. Nonetheless, even if the Examiner's position were appropriate, Hochman designed slot 24 with certain features, such as keys 30 and 32 and a tongue 34, for specific reasons. (See, e.g., Hochman col. 5, lines 33-46 and Figs. 6 and 6A.) Given this description, one skilled in the art would not have been motivated to replace Hochman's slot 24 with a perforated longitudinal partition because one skilled in the art would have understood that the resulting device may very well not work as intended by Hochman.

Further, even if one skilled in the art had somehow been motivated to modify Hochman and that person had considered Utterberg, it is apparent that Utterberg would not cure Hochman's deficiencies, at least because, like Hochman, Utterberg does not disclose or suggest a delivery tube having a perforated longitudinal partition with a hub opening.

Neither Hochman nor Utterberg, alone or in combination, discloses or suggests the subject matter covered by claims 1-5, 12 and 17-19. There is no suggestion to combine these references to provide such subject matter, and, even if the references were combined, the result would not be the subject matter covered by claims 1-5, 12 and 17-19. Accordingly, Applicants request reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection.

The Examiner rejected claims 14-16 as being unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) Hochman in view of Utterberg and further in view of Chang. But, claims 14-16 require a

delivery tube having a perforated longitudinal partition with a hub opening. As explained above, neither Hochman nor Utterberg, alone or in combination, discloses or suggests such a delivery tube. Chang does not cure this deficiency, at least because Chang also does not disclose or suggest a delivery tube having a perforated longitudinal partition with a hub opening.

None of Hochman, Utterberg or Chang, alone or in combination, discloses or suggests the subject matter covered by claims 14-16. There is no suggestion to combine these references to provide such subject matter, and, even if the references were combined, the result would not be the subject matter covered by claims 14-16. Accordingly, Applicants request reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection.

Applicants believe the application is in condition for allowance, which action is requested.

Please apply any charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: June 21, 2006



Sean P. Daley  
Reg. No. 40,978

Fish & Richardson P.C.  
225 Franklin Street  
Boston, MA 02110  
Telephone: (617) 542-5070  
Facsimile: (617) 542-8906